You believe that fewer people are getting married because of the trivialization of sex, and that more married people are getting divorced. You believe that divorce is a terrible thing, and that the prospect of it is preventing people from getting married. The simple solution seems to be to eliminate the institution of marriage itself, and the problem of divorce immediately disappears.

carnage_complex, tell me if I understand what you're saying.

You believe that a degenerate capitalistic system results in a commodification of sexuality. This enables the creation of a cultural notion that premarital sexuality is acceptable. This results in sexuality becoming widespread. This has three primary consequences:

The first is that there are some males who believe that the existence of this attitude of sexuality is a justification of date rape, which causes instances of it to increase.

The second is that the existence of this attitude destroys the significance of marriages. Fewer people get married, and of the people who do get married, more divorce.

The third is that the prevalence of sexuality results in more abortions, and more unwanted children, than would otherwise result.

You believe that it would be desirable to outlaw premarital sex to cause a gradual cultural shift away from all of this.

And I would like you to briefly elaborate on something so that I can better understand your position. What is it about marriage that appeals to you, and why do you oppose the prevalence of divorces?

You claim that marriage is a wonderfully positive thing, and it would be undesirable to eliminate marriage. If marriage permits people to share such wonderful love, then why limit it to only one person (or in the case of polygamists, a select few)? Why not allow someone to marry everyone else in the entire world? It sounds like a completely nonsensical idea because of what marriage actually is. Marriage does not permit the blossoming of love: it eradicates the potential to love. It is the restriction of that allegedly wonderful relationship to only one person, to the detriment of everyone else. Saying that marriage is a positive institution is saying that restricted and culturally-defined love is preferable to boundless love. Marriage is not love: marriage is hatred.

Marriage is not the only institution of its kind: the rest of romantic love is the same way. Your culture tells you that you must feel and act a certain way toward someone with whom you're in a "romantic relationship", and that it is unacceptable to feel the same way toward someone else. The same applies to what culture calls "familial love". Solely on the basis of ancestry, you are supposed to feel and act a certain way toward someone who happens to be particularly more genetically-similar to you than someone else.

There are all sorts of bizarre cultural labels for love and relationships which people are indoctrinated into having, and they all amount to the same thing. The effect of them is the compartmentalization of love for those who are in the group your culture tells you you're a part of, and the absence of the love for those who are outside of it. Love is not innately labelled: it is your culture which indoctrinates you into believing that there are such metaphysical things as "romantic love" as distinct from love. Why should the definitions of relationships be forced onto people? What makes a relative different from a stranger? What makes an American different than a Soviet? Why should you treat someone you're in a romantic relationship differently than someone you're in a friendship with? I cannot find anything positive in the cultural context which marriages, families, courtships, nationalities, ethnicities, religions, and whatever other bizarre categorizations there are. I won't profess to know a single thing about what associations are supposed to entail for people, because that should be entirely up to the individuals involved, completely beyond any arbitrary cultural context.

You are opposed to prevalent sex partially because it trivializes the meaning of sex. Why can't people's interactions be defined by those involved? Why support compelling people to believe that having sex with each other is any different from tying each other's shoes? If they want to associate particular meanings to it, then they can do so.

"Compelling" is an understatement for what you advocate. Your solution is to use the government to fine and castrate people who engage in premarital sex, which you claim is prevalent because of the capitalistic commoditization of sex. If that is the case, then why not instead reject the government itself, which enables the existence of the capitalistic system? You say that it is worth doing this to spare even a single person from the trauma of date rape, but what of the immense trauma which violators of your law would endure? Not even having harmed anyone themselves, they are fined, kidnapped, imprisoned, and castrated by their government. I do not see how it would be a desirable solution to torture people who do not conform to your beliefs of how they could best live their lives.

You know of instances where females have been raped because of the cultural notion that premarital sex is acceptable. To prevent that, you want to compel people to have the cultural notion that it is acceptable for people to be castrated for engaging in premarital sex. Instead of arguing about this or that being the right or wrong perspective and attitude, and subsequently seeking to violently impose your will onto other people, why not seek to entirely eliminate the notion of cultural attitudes themselves?

"Now, let's take a look at another common situation. A childhood friend of mine in a relationship with someone recently was gotten pregnant by him. She was panicked beyond all understanding, because she wanted to abort the child, but couldn't bring herself to do it, and has now decided to carry it to term. Both this young woman and her boyfriend were attending a prestigious university; both had futures ahead of them. Both have since dropped out of school. He is working two minimum wage jobs to support her, and she expects that she is now going to lose at least a couple of years before she can get back on the

career track again. Had this same couple waited until they were done school, and until they were married and he was in a decent job, then this never would have happened. Two lives have been put on hold because of one impulsive act. I wonder what that child's formative years are going to be like, given the fact that he or she has two parents who resent him or her on some level."
"Had this same couple waited until they were done school, and until they were married and he was in a decent job, then this never would have happened."
You're critical of capitalism, yet make an appeal to a "prestigious university", "futures", and "career tracks". These exist because of a capitalistic system and help to further propagate its existence, so I would have expected you to be opposed to that. I don't know anything about your political ideology, so I'll just leave it at this:

You want to support a government which enables you to inflict your violent will onto people "for their own good" to prevent them from possibly suffering adverse consequences which exist owing to an external system. That system is enabled by the existence of governments. Wouldn't it be more sensible to oppose governments, which subject people into a capitalistic system? It is not as though those minimum wage jobs disappear once your friends graduate from a prestigious university and get on their career track for the future- it merely enables your friends to shirk laboring and instead force other people to labor for them.
Instead of seeking a societal restructuring which is brought about by supporting a government to enable you to inflict your violent will onto people to prevent them from possibly suffering adverse consequences because of their actions owing to a system which exists because of governments, you should instead be opposed to the institution.

These same people you would castrate.

I said allegedly wonderful because it is difficult for me to believe that marriage is remotely positive, even beyond what I said earlier. I can only see marriage as being innately mutually abusive.

I'm an ultra-virgin like Mayhem, and the last contact beyond handshakes I've had with anyone was when my grandmother hugged me four years ago.

You are treating the actions of the the government as being metaphysically different than Eric and Dylan, when it seems clear to me that a travesty is not any less bad because a government decreed that it was okay.
What you condone is not even in the slightest any different from Eric and Dylan. I don't know if you're one of their groupies, but I assume you join the finger-wagging against them. Yet, you condone the slaughter of anyone who does not conform to your notion of behavior.